

REMARKS

This is a response to a Final Office Action mailed on April 10, 2006. Claims 1-12 are allowed. Claim 13-20 are rejected. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Applicants have amended Claim 13 to further clarify the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added by this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Igrashi et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0016492 (hereinafter “Igrashi”), in view of Faccin et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0118674 (hereinafter “Faccin”), in further view of Narayanan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,922,404 (hereinafter “Narayanan”).

Amended Claim 13 now recites “creating a plurality of session keys by the AAAH and at least another session key by the AAAF.” The Office Action states: “[n]either [Igarashi nor Faccin] expressly mentions creating a plurality of session keys. However in analogous art, Narayanan teaches creating a plurality of session keys by the AAAH and the AAAF.” Office Action, p. 4, para 3(c). However, as the Office Action states in its allowance of Claim 1, Narayanan does not expressly mention that the AAAH generates two of the session keys. Office Action, p. 7, para. 5. With this amendment, amended Claim 13 now recites that the AAAH creates (e.g. generates) at least two (i.e. a plurality) of session keys. At least for this reason, Claim 13 is not made obvious by Igarashi in view of Faccin in further view of Narayanan. Therefore, Claim 13 should be in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Claims 14-20 depend from Claim 13 and should be allowable for substantially similar reasons as for Claim 13.

Allowable Subject Matter


The Office Action indicates that the prior amendments and arguments were persuasive in response to the previous office action. Thus, the Office Action has allowed Claims 1-12 are allowed because prior art reference US patent No. 6,922,404 to Narayanan et al. (hereinafter "Narayanan") does not expressly mention that the AAAH generates two of the session keys, as recited in Claim 1. Applicants agree that Narayanan does not teach this limitation. However, Applicants also submit that Claim 1 is also novel and non-obvious because of other limitations recited in the claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Thomas Marquis
Registration No. 46,900
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8900 • (212) 527-7701 fax
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant